

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The priority papers were filed with the original application papers and their receipt was acknowledged in the above-mentioned Examiner's Action. The undersigned hereby reiterates the priority claim made in the earlier-filed Declaration.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the braking formation shown at 10 in FIG. 7 and so as to have generally the same scope as independent claim 12. In addition dependent claims 13 and 14 have been added to describe this braking formation as a roughening that engages the object on its one side with greater friction than on the other side of the slot.

The reason this rotation is necessary is that it is possible for the objects (normally pills) to be chipped. Such chipped pills must be culled since they will not have the desired volume and, therefore, will not provide the desired dose. With the system of this invention even if a pill lands in the groove oriented so that it can bridge the slot, it will be rotated and will, at one point, have its chipped edge to the side and will fall through the slot. Thus this system effectively sorts out chipped or noncircular objects.

There is nothing resembling this structure in the references. More particularly US 4,640,407 of Widener the two sides of the trough 42 are identical. There is nothing to rotate the fuel plugs of Widener; it is apparently presumed that they are all of perfect shape and that all that they need to be is oriented appropriately.


There is therefore a clear-cut structural difference between the instant invention and the system of Widener, making a §102 rejection impossible. Since nothing in Widener suggests that the plugs should be rotated to ensure that noncircular ones are culled, a §103 rejection on this reference is similarly impossible.

US 3,738,465 of Ettlinger is largely cumulative to Widener. It does in fact vibrate the objects bridging the slot, so that they move about and, with luck, orient themselves to fall through the slot, but there is nothing resembling the roughening or braking surface now claimed that simply and positively effects the desired rotation. At best Ettlinger shows an attempt to make a system as effective as that of the instant invention, but one that achieves less reliable results with substantially more complex means. Ettlinger thus does not add enough to the teachings of Widener to form a valid §103 rejection, as there is no braking surface to one side, much less the claimed roughening.

For these reasons the claims of the case are clearly in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

06 October 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: None.